Joint Channel Estimation and Training Signal Design for Two-way MIMO Relay Systems

Huiming Chen
Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering
the University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China
Email: hmchen@eee.hku.hk

Xiaohan Zhong
College of Electronics and Information Engineering
Sichuan University
Chengdu, China
Email: zxh_elaine@163.com

arXiv:1606.04022v1 [cs.IT] 13 Jun 2016

***Abstract*—In this paper, a two-stage channel estimation scheme for two-way MIMO relay systems with a single relay antenna is proposed. The backward channel is estimated by using linear minimum mean square estimator (LMMSE) at the first stage, where the optimal training signal is designed. We then mainly focus on the forward channel estimation by using singular value decomposition (SVD) based maximum likelihood method, and the related training signal is proposed. We note that the forward channel estimator is nonlinear and by analyzing the asymptotic Bayesian Cramér-rao Lower Bound (BCRLB), we seek BCRLB as the criterion for training signal design. Finally, the numerical results show that the proposed training signal can improve the MSE performance.**

I. Introduction

Relay deployed in wireless systems has been extensively studied in recent years due to its capability in strengthening long range communications and enlarging the coverage of cellular networks [1], [2]. Three relay assited retransmission protocols are widely used, which are amplify-and-forward (AF), decode-and-forward (DF) and compress-and-forward (CF). Among the three scenarios, AF is the simplest which just amplifies and re-transmits the received signal to the destination node.

For the one-way AF relay systems (OWARS), the channel estimation algorithms have also been widely studied in [3] and [4]. In [3], the least-square (LS) and the linear minimum mean square error (LMMSE) estimators for the channel estimation are respectively derived, where the optimal training signals for the two estimation schemes are also respectively derived by minimizing the MSE of the estimators. In [4], the SVD-ML method is derived to solve the channel estimation problems.

For a two-way AF relay system (TWARS), superimposed training signals and two-stage channel estimation have been proposed in [6], where the Golden section search (GSS) is applied to find the optimal training signals. The composite channel estimation in two-way MIMO relay systems has been derived by using LMMSE method in [7]. The optimal training signal is proposed with the criterion of the MSE of the estimators. MAP estimation scheme has been proposed for both the composite and individual channel estimation in [8].

In this paper, we propose a two-stage channel estimation scheme which combines LMMSE and SVD-ML methods to obtain the individual channel estimators. We assume that the training process is performed under Rayleigh fading channels. The LMMSE method is applied to obtain the backward channel estimators at the first stage and the related training signal is derived. Treat the estimated backward channels as deterministic variable, the SVD-ML method is employed to obtain the forward channel estimators. In particularly, we seek BCRLB as the training signal design criterion. The numerical results show that the MSE performance of the estimators with the proposed training scheme is improved.

The remaining paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the system model. The two-stage channel estimation is introduced in section III. Section IV describes the optimization of the training signal. Numerical results are provided in section V to verify the channel estimation and training algorithm. The conclusion is in section VI.

II. System Model

We consider a two-way MIMO relay system with a single relay antenna. The source and the relay nodes are denoted $\mathbb{S}_i, i = 1, 2$ and $\mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{S}_i$ are equiped with N_i antennas and $\mathbb{R}$ is equipped with a single antenna. The channel estimation scheme is conducted in two stages. The first stage requires one time slot and the relay node $\mathbb{R}$ transmits two same training signals $\mathbf{p}_R \in \mathbb{C}^{1\times L_r}$ to the source node $\mathbb{S}_i$ through the backward channel $\mathbf{h}_{ir} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i\times 1}$. In this paper, we assume the Rayleigh fading channel $\mathbf{h}_{ir}$ is a complex Gaussian random matrix with entries being independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) zero mean and the variance $\sigma^2_{h_{ir}}$. Thus, the received signal $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i\times L_r}$ at $\mathbb{S}_i$ is given by:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i = \mathbf{h}_{ir}\mathbf{p}_R + \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i \tag{1}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i\times L_r}$ is the noise at $\mathbb{S}_i$ and follows i.i.d. complex Gaussian distribution as $\text{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i) \sim \sigma_i^2\mathbf{I}_{N_iL_r}$.

We now consider the second stage, which requires two time slots, and during the first time slot, the source nodes $\mathbb{S}_i$ transmits an $N_i \times L$ training signal matrix $\mathbf{S}_i$ to the relay node $\mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathbf{y}_r = \mathbf{h}_{r1}\mathbf{P}_1 + \mathbf{h}_{r2}\mathbf{P}_2 + \mathbf{v}_r \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_r \in \mathbb{C}^{1\times L}$ is the received signal at the relay node $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{h}_{ri} \in \mathbb{C}^{1\times N_i}$ is the forward channel from the source node

$\mathbb{S}_i$ to the relay node $\mathbb{R}$. Similar to the backward channel $\mathbf{h}_{ir}$, we assume that $\mathbf{h}_{ri}$ is a Rayleigh fading channel and thus a complex Gaussian random vector with i.i.d. zero mean and variance $\sigma^2_{h_{ri}}$. $\mathbf{v}_r \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times L_r}$ is the noise at $\mathbb{R}$ with entries being i.i.d. complex Gaussian distribution with variance σ_r^2. Usually, the relay node $\mathbb{R}$ first scales the mixed signal with an amplifying factor and then retransmit the amplified signal. However, for simplicity but without loss of generality, the relay $\mathbb{R}$ only retransmits the mixed signal back to the source node $\mathbb{S}_i$ without performing amplification. Hence, the received signal during the second time slot at the second stage is given by:

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{h}_{ir}\mathbf{h}_{r1}\mathbf{P}_1 + \mathbf{h}_{ir}\mathbf{h}_{r2}\mathbf{P}_2 + \mathbf{h}_{ir}\mathbf{v}_r + \mathbf{V}_i \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times L}$ is the received signal at the source node $\mathbb{S}_i$, $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_i \times L}$ is the i.i.d. Gaussian noise at $\mathbb{S}_i$ with variance σ_i^2.

III. Channel Estimation

A. LMMSE Estimation for the Backward Channel

LMMSE method is widely used in practice due to the ease of the implementation. Therefore, we adopt LMMSE method to obtain the backward channel estimator. By using the identity $\text{vec}(\mathbf{ABC}) = (\mathbf{C}^T \otimes \mathbf{A})\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})$, and defining $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i \triangleq \text{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i \triangleq \text{vec}(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_i)$, (1) can be reformulated:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i = (\mathbf{p}_R^T \otimes \mathbf{I}_{N_i})\mathbf{h}_{ir} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i \tag{4}$$

For the transmission formula (1) at the first stage, assume a LMMSE matrix $\mathbf{G}_{ir}$ is applied:

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir} = \mathbf{G}_{ir}^H \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i \tag{5}$$

and the LMMSE matrix $\mathbf{G}_{ir}$ is easily derived by taking derivative of $\text{MSE}_i = \text{Tr}\{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{G}_{ir}^H\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{h}_{ir})(\mathbf{G}_{ir}^H\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{h}_{ir})^H\}$ with respect to $\mathbf{G}_{ir}$:

$$\mathbf{G}_{ir}^H = \mathbf{R}_{h_{ir}\tilde{y}_i} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{y}_i}^{-1} \tag{6}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{h_{ir}\tilde{y}_i}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{y}_i}^{-1}$ is given by:

$$\mathbf{R}_{h_{ir}\tilde{y}_i} = \sigma^2_{h_{ir}}\mathbf{p}_R^* \otimes \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \tag{7}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{y}_i} = \sigma^2_{h_{ir}}\mathbf{p}_R^T\mathbf{p}_R^* \otimes \mathbf{I}_i + \sigma_i^2\mathbf{I}_{N_iL_r} \tag{8}$$

We next define the estimator error as: $\Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir} \triangleq \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir} - \mathbf{h}_{ir}$, subsequently the covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}_{\Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir}}$ of $\Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir}$ is calculated [9]:

$$\mathbf{C}_{\Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir}} = (\sigma^2_{h_{ir}} + \sigma_i^{-2}\mathbf{p}_R^*\mathbf{p}_R^T)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \tag{9}$$

For the optimal training signal design, we choose MSE as the criterion. Hence, the optimization problem is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{s}_R} \quad & \text{Tr}(\mathbf{C}_{\Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir}}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{Tr}(\mathbf{p}_R\mathbf{p}_R^H) \le P_r \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

From (9), when the term $\mathbf{p}_R\mathbf{p}_R^H$ is increasing, the objective function is monotonically decreasing. According to the power constraint at the relay node $\mathbb{R}$, when $\mathbf{p}_R\mathbf{p}_R^H$ reaches to Pr, i.e., $\mathbf{p}_R\mathbf{p}_R^H = Pr$, the objective function is minimized. Subsequently, Let an $1 \times L_r$ vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_R = [u_r, \mathbf{0}]$, where u_r can be treated as 1×1 unitary matrix. The solution to (10) is easily derived as:

$$\mathbf{p}_R = \sqrt{P_r}\boldsymbol{\theta}_R \tag{11}$$

B. Channel Estimation for the Forward Channel

For the ML method, we first substitute $\mathbf{H}_{ir} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{ir} - \Delta\mathbf{H}_{ir}$ into (3), which yields:

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\mathbf{h}_c\mathbf{P} + \bar{\mathbf{V}}_i \tag{12}$$

where $\mathbf{h}_c \triangleq [\mathbf{h}_{r1}^H, \mathbf{h}_{r2}^H]^H$ and $\mathbf{P} \triangleq [\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{P}_2]$, $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_i \triangleq \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\mathbf{v}_r - \Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir}\mathbf{h}_c\mathbf{P} - \Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir}\mathbf{v}_r + \mathbf{V}_i$.

Define the composite channel as $\mathbf{H}_c \triangleq \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\mathbf{h}_c$, by definition, the ML estimation is known to be given by:

$$\max_{\mathbf{H}_c} \quad \text{P}(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{H}_c) \tag{13}$$

where $\text{P}(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{H}_c)$ is the probability density function (pdf) of $\mathbf{Y}_i$ conditioned on $\mathbf{h}_c$.

Therefore, to derive the formula of (19), the probability distribution of $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_i$ should be derived. In the next calculation, the estimated channel $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}$ is treated as the deterministic vector. Before proceeding, the following lemma is useful in this paper:

Lemma 1 [6]: For $\text{vec}(\mathbf{H}) \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Theta} \otimes \boldsymbol{\Phi})$, there are $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{HAH}^H] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T)\boldsymbol{\Phi}$, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}^H\mathbf{AH}] = \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}\mathbf{A})\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T$.

By using *Lemma* 1, the covariance matrix of $\text{vec}(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_i)$ is straightforwardly calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_{\bar{v}_i} = & \sum_{k=1}^{2} \mathbf{P}_k^T\mathbf{P}_k^* \otimes \sigma^2_{h_{rk}}\mathbf{C}_{\Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir}} + \mathbf{I}_L \otimes (\\ & \sigma_r^2\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}^H + \sigma_i^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i} - \sigma_r^2\mathbf{C}_{\Delta\mathbf{h}_{ir}}) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Note that, under the assumption that the transmission power at the first stage is large enough, it is easy to show the following asymptotic expression $\lim_{P_r\to\infty} \mathbf{R}_{\bar{v}_i} = \mathbf{B}_i$, where we define $\mathbf{B}_i \triangleq \sigma_r^2\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}^H + \sigma_i^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i}$. Also note that $\lim_{P_r\to\infty} \bar{\mathbf{V}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\mathbf{v}_r + \mathbf{V}_i$.

Therefore, with the assumption that the relay transmission power is large enough, we have the following approximations:

$$\mathbf{R}_{\bar{v}_i} \approx \mathbf{I}_L \otimes (\sigma_r^2\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}^H + \sigma_i^2\mathbf{I}_{N_i}) \tag{15}$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{V}}_i \approx \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\mathbf{v}_r + \mathbf{V}_i \tag{16}$$

Based on (15) and (16), we can readily derive $\text{P}(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{h}_c)$ and $\text{P}(\mathbf{h}_c)$ respectively as:

$$\text{P}(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{h}_c) = (2\pi)^{-N_iL}\text{det}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_L \otimes \mathbf{B}_i)\text{exp}[-\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{A}_i^H\mathbf{B}_i^{-1})] \tag{17}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_i \triangleq \mathbf{Y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\mathbf{h}_c\mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{R}_{h_c}$ is the covariance matrix of $\mathbf{h}_c$ and is to calculated as $\mathbf{R}_{h_c} = blkdiag\{\sigma^2_{h_{r1}}\mathbf{I}_{N_1}, \sigma^2_{h_{r2}}\mathbf{I}_{N_2}\}$.

Therefore, the optimization problem in (13) is equivalent to minimize the terms in log-likelihood function as:

$$\min_{\mathbf{H}_c} \quad \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{A}_i^H\mathbf{B}_i^{-1}) \tag{18}$$

Our next task is to apply the SVD-ML method employed in OWARS for our systems. Our estimation scenario is estimate

the composite channel first, and then with the estimated backward channel, we obtain the forward channel. We would like to first introduce the following theorem:

Theorem 1 [4]: For an observation: $\mathbf{X} = \sqrt{\beta}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{f}\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{W}$, where $\mathbf{W} \triangleq \mathbf{u}\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{V}$ the entries of $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{g}$ are assumed to be complex Gaussian random variables, entries of $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are assumed to be i.i.d. complex Gaussian with zero-mean and unit-variance. Defining $a \triangleq \|\mathbf{f}\|_F \|\mathbf{g}\|_F, \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \triangleq \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\|f\|_F}, \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \triangleq \frac{\mathbf{g}}{\|g\|_F}$, subsequently for the optimization problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{f}\cdot\mathbf{g}} \quad & \mathrm{Tr}[(\mathbf{X} - a\sqrt{\beta}\mathbf{S}\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})^H(\mathbf{X} - a\sqrt{\beta}\mathbf{S}\tilde{\mathbf{f}}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}) \\ & (\mathbf{I}_{N_i} - \eta_i\tilde{\mathbf{g}}^H\tilde{\mathbf{g}})] \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

the solution is given by:

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}\mathbf{g}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}}(\mathbf{S}^H\mathbf{S})^{-1}\mathbf{S}^H\mathbf{X}\mathbf{v}_1\mathbf{v}_1^H \tag{20}$$

where we have the following definitions:

$$\mathbf{\Omega}_i \triangleq \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}^H)^{-1}\mathbf{S}^H \tag{21}$$

$$\mathbf{Z}_i \triangleq [\mathbf{\Omega}_i + \sqrt{\eta_i}(\mathbf{I}_L - \mathbf{\Omega}_i)] \tag{22}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_1$ is the right singular vector of $\mathbf{Z}_i$ with respective to the biggest singular value σ_1.

To use Theorem 1, let:

$$\mathbf{Y}_i^T = \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}^T = \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{h}_c^T = \mathbf{f}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}^T = \mathbf{g}, \bar{\mathbf{V}}_i^T = \mathbf{W} \tag{23}$$

Subsequently, the composite channel is estimated as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_c = \mathbf{v}_1^*\mathbf{v}_1^T\mathbf{Y}_i\mathbf{P}^H(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^H)^{-1} \tag{24}$$

For (24), η_i is calculated to be:

$$\eta_i = \frac{\sigma_i^{-2}\sigma_r^2\left\|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\right\|_F^2}{1 + \sigma_i^{-2}\sigma_r^2\left\|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}\right\|_F^2}. \tag{25}$$

Therefore, given the estimated composite channel and forward channel, the estimated individual channel from the relay node to $\mathbb{S}_i$ is derived by using pseudo-inverse:

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_c = (\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}^H\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir})^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}^H\hat{\mathbf{H}}_c \tag{26}$$

IV. BCRLB Training Signal Design at Stage Two

We have derived the two-stage channel estimation scheme, we next consider the criterion for the training signal design at the second stage. In many practical optimal training signal designs, the sum MSE has been choosen as the criterion [3], [7] and [6]. Cramer-ráo Lower Bound (CRLB) criterion for optimal training sequences have been provided in [10]. However, in our case, due to the nonlinearity in MSE of the forward channel estimator, the tractable analytical expression of the MSE is infeasible. Since the the family of CRLBs has been shown to tightly lower bound on the estimation MSE in many practical scenarios, we therefore seek to minimize the trace of the BCRLB to obtain the training signal.

Let us introduce the definition of $\mathbf{BIM}_i$ first:

$$\mathbf{BIM}_i = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}\{\mathbf{FIM}_i\} + \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}\{-\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}\log p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)\} \tag{27}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_p,\boldsymbol{\theta}_q}f \triangleq \frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}_p}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}_q^H})$ is the second-order derivative of complex valued scalar function f [11]. Let us define the unknown parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ as $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{h}_c)$, subsequently the Fisher information matrix (FIM) with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ is derived as [9]:

$$\mathbf{FIM}_i = \mathbb{E}[(\frac{\partial\log P(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{h}_c)}{\partial\mathrm{vec}^T(\mathbf{h}_c)})^H(\frac{\partial\log P(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{h}_c)}{\partial\mathrm{vec}^T(\mathbf{h}_c)})] \tag{28}$$

We first derive the first order derivative of the log-likelihood function with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ as:

$$\frac{\partial\log P(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{h}_c)}{\partial\mathrm{vec}^T(\mathbf{h}_c)} = [(\mathbf{P}^* \otimes \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}^H\mathbf{B}_i^{-1})\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{A}_i)]^H \tag{29}$$

subsequently, according to the definition of the $\mathbf{FIM}_i$, we take the expectation with respect to $\mathbf{A}_i$, which yields the result:

$$\mathbf{FIM}_i = q_i\mathbf{P}^*\mathbf{P}^T \tag{30}$$

where $\mathbf{q}_i \triangleq \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}^H\mathbf{B}_i^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{ir}$.

For the second term in the definition of $\mathbf{BIM}_i$ in (27), it is straightforwardly calculated as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}\{-\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}\log p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)\} = blkdiag\{\sigma_{h_{r1}}^{-2}\mathbf{I}_{N_1}, \sigma_{h_{r2}}^{-2}\mathbf{I}_{N_2}\} \tag{31}$$

It should be noted that since we assume the relay transmission power at the first stage is large, there is no need to take into account the optimization constraint for the training signal design at the second stage. Subsequently, we yield the optimization problems as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{S}_k, k=1,2} \quad & g = \sum_{i=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{BIM}_i^{-1}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{P}_k\mathbf{P}_k^H) \le P_k, k = 1, 2 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Expand the objective function in (32), which yields:

$$g_i = \mathrm{Tr}(\begin{bmatrix} q_i\mathbf{P}_1^*\mathbf{P}_1^T + \sigma_{h_{r1}}^{-2}\mathbf{I}_{N_1} & q_i\mathbf{P}_1^*\mathbf{P}_2^T \\ q_i\mathbf{P}_2^*\mathbf{P}_1^T & q_i\mathbf{P}_2^*\mathbf{P}_2^T + \sigma_{h_{r2}}^{-2}\mathbf{I}_{N_2} \end{bmatrix})^{-1} \tag{33}$$

From (33), we can therefore readily draw the conclusion that to diagonalize the matrix inside the trace operator, the training signals $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ should satisfy:

$$\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{P}_2^H = 0 \tag{34}$$

Subsequently, (33) can be rewritten into

$$g_i = \sum_{k=1}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}(q_i\mathbf{P}_k^*\mathbf{P}_k^T + \sigma_{h_{rk}}^{-2}\mathbf{I}_{N_k})^{-1} \tag{35}$$

It can be seen in (35) that to minimize the objective function in (32), $\mathbf{S}_k\mathbf{S}_k^H$ should be diagonal matrix. According to the discussion above, let us define $\mathbf{\Xi} \triangleq [\mathbf{\Xi}_1^H, \mathbf{\Xi}_2^H]^H \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_1+N_2)\times L}$, let $\mathbf{\Xi} = [\mathbf{U}_F, \mathbf{0}]$, where $\mathbf{\Xi}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_1\times L)}$ and $\mathbf{\Xi}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_2\times L)}$ are submatrices of $\mathbf{\Xi}$, $\mathbf{U}_F \in \mathbb{C}^{(N_1+N_2)\times(N_1+N_2)}$ is a unitary matrix. Subsequently, we propose an immmediate choice of $\mathbf{P}_k$ to diagonalize $\mathbf{P}_k\mathbf{P}_k^H$:

$$\mathbf{P}_k = \mathbf{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{*}{2}}\mathbf{\Xi}_k^* \tag{36}$$

where $\mathbf{\Sigma}_k$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\{\varsigma_{k,l}\}_{l=1}^{N_k}$. Therefore, the optimization problem (32) can be equivalently rewritten in scalar form, and a specific search algorithm can efficiently applied to obtain the training signal.

According to the discussion above, the optimization problem is formulated as:

$$\min_{\varsigma_{k,l}} \quad J = \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{k=1}^{2}\sum_{l=1}^{N_k}(\sigma_{h_{rk}}^{-2} + q_i\varsigma_{k,l})^{-1} \tag{37}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{l=1}^{N_k}\varsigma_{k,l} \le P_k, k = 1,2 \tag{38}$$

$$\varsigma_{k,l} \ge 0, \quad k = 1,2, l = 1,2,\ldots,N_k \tag{39}$$

The objective function (37) is a easily verified to be convex with respect to $\varsigma_{k,l}$. Moreover, the power constraints (38) is in linear form, therefore, the problem (37)-(39) is verified to be a convex optimization problem with respect to $\varsigma_{k,l}$.

$\varsigma_{k,l}$ can be efficiently obtained through the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality conditions for $\varsigma_{k,l}$ and the gradient condition is given by:

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\varsigma_{k,l}} = -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\frac{q_i}{(\sigma_{h_{rk}}^{-2} + q_i\varsigma_{k,l})^2} + \mu_k = 0, \quad k = 1,2, l = 1,2,\ldots,N_k \tag{40}$$

where μ_k and ν_k are the Lagrange multipliers satisfying the complementary slackness conditions:

$$\mu_k(\sum_{l=1}^{N_k}\varsigma_{k,l} - P_k) = 0, \tag{41}$$

$$\nu_{k,l}\varsigma_{k,l} = 0, k = 1,2, s = 1,2,\ldots,N_k. \tag{42}$$

Note that in (40), the left hand side (LHS) is monotonically decreasing function with respect to the positive $\varsigma_{k,l}$, which can be obtained by using bisection search. Also note the LHS in (38), since $\varsigma_{k,l}$ is monotonically decreasing function of μ_k, an outer loop bisection search is applied to efficiently find the optimal μ_k. Hence, we apply the two-loop bisection search algorithm to find the solution to the optimizaiton problem (37)-(39).

V. Numerical Results

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the two-stage channel estimation for both composite and individual channels through numerical results. We consider a two-way MIMO relay system with a single relay antenna, where the source nodes are equipped with the same number of antennas, i.e., $N_i = N = 4, i = 1,2$. For the channel variance, we assume that all Rayleigh fading channels have the unit variance of each entry. For simplicity but without loss of generality, we assume that the noise at all nodes have unit variance, i.e., $\sigma_r^2 = \sigma_i^2 = 1$. For the length of training signals at the first stage, we assume the length is $L_r = N_r + 5$. Similarly for the second stage, we use the shortest length training signals, i.e., $L = N_1 + N_2$. We also assume the source


MSE of the backward channel estimator
Relay power to unit ratio Pr (dB)
Optimal Training Signal
Non−optimal Training Signal

Fig. 1. Backward channel estimation at the first stage.

training signals have the same transmission power. The ratio of transmission power to unit power is denoted as P (dB). Specifically, we use the normalized DFT matrix to be the unitary matrix for the training signals at stage 1 and stage 2, i.e., $u_R = \exp(-j2\pi), \mathbf{U}_F(p,q) = 1/\sqrt{2N}\exp(-j2\pi pq/2N)$. The average normalized MSE of both backward channel and forward channel estimation are calculated respectively through Monte Carlo, which averages over 10^3 channel realizations. Without loss of generality, we consider the backward channel and forward channel estimated at source node $\mathbb{S}_1$.

In the first example as is shown in Fig.1, we compare the performance of LMMSE channel estimation at the first stage with different training schemes. The proposed optimal training signal, which is also an orthogonal training signal, and the non-optimal training signal are applied respectively. The non-optimal training signal is slightly below the power constraint. The numerical result shows that the optimal training signal performs better than the non-optimal training signal, which matches the theory.

In the second example, we evaluate the performance of the SVD-ML method for composite channel estimation as is shown in Fig.2. We apply two training scenarios: (1). The proposed BCRLB training signal; (2). Non-optimal training signals in two cases, where the transmission powers all meet the power constraint but not satisfy the KKT condition in (40). The two training schemes are also applied to entry-based ML method [4]. From Fig.2, it can be seen that for each training scheme, SVD-ML method performs better than entry based ML method. Meanwhile, the BCRLB training scheme outperforms than the non-optimal training scheme.

In the last example as is shown in Fig.3, we compare the training signal performance for forward channel estimation. Note that the forward channel estimator is derived based on the estimated composite channel. Therefore, similar to the second example, the composite channel is obtained employing SVD-ML and entry based ML method for comparison. The training scenarios in the second example are applied to the two estimation method respectively. The numerical result


MSE of composite channel estimator
Source transmission power to unit ratio P (dB)
Subplot−3
Subplot−1
Subplot−2
BCRLB suboptimal Training Signal−SVD Based ML
Non−optimal Training Signal 1−SVD Based ML
Non−optimal Training Signal 2−SVD Based ML
BCRLB Suboptimal Training Signal−Entry Based ML
Non−optimal Training Signal 1−Entry Based ML
Non−optimal Training Signal 2−Entry Based ML

Fig. 2. Composite channel estimation at the second stage.


MSE of the forward channel estimator
Source transmission power to unit ratio P (dB)
Subplot−3
Subplot−1
Subplot−2
BCRLB suboptimal Training Signal−SVD Based ML
Non−optimal Training Signal 1−SVD Based ML
Non−optimal Training Signal 2−SVD Based ML
BCRLB Suboptimal Training Signal−Entry Based ML
Non−optimal Training Signal 1−Entry Based ML
Non−optimal Training Signal 2−Entry Based ML

Fig. 3. Forward channel estimation at the second stage.

shows that the proposed BCRLB training signal applied to both estimation methods outperforms than the other non-optimal training schemes. Moreover, the MSE performance of the forward estimator based on SVD-ML composite channel estimation outperforms than that based on entry-ML method.

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel SVD-ML method for forward channel estimation in two-stage estimation scheme. Given the backward channel estimated at the first stage as deterministic vector, and the probability of the estimator error, the forward channel estimator is obtained with SVD-ML. For training signal design at the second stage, we first analyze the asymptotic distribution of the total noise, and the approximated BCRLB is derived, based on which, we find the training signal. In numerical results, for the second stage, we consider the two training scenarios: (1). BCRLB training signal; (2). Non-optimal training signals. It is shown that under both training scenarios, composite and forward channel estimation based on SVD-ML outperforms than that based on entry-ML. For training scenarios, the BCRLB training signal outperforms than the non-optimal scheme for both SVD-ML and entry-ML methods.

References

[1] L. A. Scaglione, D. L. Goeckel, and J. N. Laneman, "Cooperative communications in mobile Ad Hoc networks,"*IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 18-29, Sep. 2006.

[2] I. E. Telatar, "Capacity of multi-antenna Gaussian channels, *Eur. Trans. Telecommun.*, vol. 10, pp. 585-595, Nov. 1999.

[3] F. Gao, T. Cui, and A. Nallanathan, "On channel estimation and optimal training design for amplify and forward relay networks,"*IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 1907-1916, May 2008.

[4] Y. Jing and X. Yu, "ML-Based Channel Estimations for Non-Regenerative Relay Networks with Multiple Transmit and Receive Antennas,"*IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1428-1439, Sep. 2012.

[5] A. Scaglione, P. Stoica, S. Barbarossa, G. B. Giannakis, and H. Sampath, "Optimal designs for space-time linear precoders and decoders,"*IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1051-1064, May 2002.

[6] C. W. R. Chiong, Y. Rong, and Y. Xiang, "Channel Training Algorithms for Two-Way MIMO Relay Systems,"*IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 16, pp. 3988 - 3998, Aug. 2013.

[7] D.-H. Kim, M. Ju, and H.-M. Kim, "Optimal training signal design for estimation of correlated MIMO channels in two-way amplify and-forward relay systems,"*IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 491-494, Mar. 2013.

[8] X. Xie, M. Peng, B. Zhao, W. Wang, and Y. Hua, "Maximum a posteriori based channel estimation strategy for two-way relaying channels,"*IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 450-463, Jan. 2014.

[9] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing: Estimation Theory.* Englewood Cilffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993.

[10] F. Gao, T. Cui, and A. Nallanathan, "Optimal training design for channel estimation in decode-and-forward relay networks with individual and total power constraints,"*IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 5937-5949, Dec. 2008.

[11] A. Hjorungnes and D. Gesbert, "Hessians of scalar functions of complex-valued matrices: A systematic computational approach,"in *Proc. 9th Int. Symp. Signal Process. Appl. (ISSPA) 2007*, 2007. 55, no. 6, pp. 2740-2746, Jun. 2007.


Optimal Training Signal
Diagonal Training Signal
MSE
P (dB)
10^{0}
10^{-1}
10^{-2}
10^{-3}
10^{-4}
10^{-5}
20
25
30
35
40
45
50


Node *1*
$\mathbf{h}_{r1,t}$
$\mathbf{h}_{1r,t}$
R
$\mathbf{h}_{r2,t}$
$\mathbf{h}_{2r,t}$
Node *2*